	Case 3.07-cv-00382-LRH-RAM Document 11 Filed 05/22/08 Page 1 01 3
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
8	
9	LAWRENCE SCHWIGER,
10	Petitioner, 3:07-cv-00382-LRH-RAM
11	VS. OPDER
12	JACK PALMER, et al., ORDER ORDER
13	Respondents.
14	
15	This action is a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, filed by
16	petitioner, a prisoner at Lovelock Correctional Center. On January 11, 2008, the Court granted
17	petitioner's application to proceed in forma pauperis. (Docket #5). The Court also denied petitioner's
18	motion for the appointment of counsel. (Id.). Finally, the Court determined that the grounds for relief
19	in the petition and motions related to petitioner's conviction are unexhausted in state court, as criminal
20	appellate proceedings remain pending before the Nevada Supreme Court. (Id.). Petitioner was granted
21	thirty days to file an amended petition showing when and how he exhausted his stated grounds for relief
22	and whether or not the referenced motions relating to his conviction are still pending in the Nevada
23	Supreme Court. (<i>Id.</i>).
24	On January 29, 2008, petitioner filed a motion for clarification (Docket #7) and motion for
25	reconsideration of the Court's denial of the appointment of counsel (Docket #8). Also on January 29,
26	2008, petitioner filed a memorandum to the Court concerning his petition. (Docket #9). Finally, or
27	February 26, 2008, petitioner filed a supplement to his motions for clarification and reconsideration.

28 (Docket #10).

The Court has reviewed all of petitioner's filings in this action. In his motion for clarification,

exhausted the grounds contained in his federal habeas petition in state court. In his motion for

clarification, petitioner states that: "It is true that there are a few motions which were denied by the state

district court which are currently on appeal and pending before the Nevada Supreme Court." (Docket

decision to the Nevada Supreme Court. (*Id.* at pp 3-4). In petitioner's memorandum accompanying his

1 2 memorandum, and supplement, petitioner makes several statements that confirm that he has, in fact, not 3 4 5 #7, at p. 2). Petitioner also states that on December 26, 2007, he filed a motion to withdraw his Alford 6 7 plea in state district court, and the hearing on the motion was set for January 9, 2008. (Docket #7, at p. 8 3). Petitioner tells this Court that he does not know when the Nevada Supreme Court will decide his appeal(s), and that he does not know the outcome of the motions filed in state district court. (Id.). 9 10 Plaintiff further tells this Court that if his motion is denied in state district court, he will appeal that 11 12 motion for clarification, he references several motions related to his conviction that "are currently on 13 14

appeal before the Supreme Court of Nevada." (Docket #9, at p. 8). Once again, petitioner is advised that he must first present his grounds for relief to the state court before a federal court may review the merits of the issues he raises. To exhaust a claim, petitioner must have "fairly presented" that specific claim to the Supreme Court of Nevada. See Picard v. Conner, 404 U.S. 270, 275-76 (1971); Schwartzmiller v. Gardner, 752 F.2d 1341, 1344 (9th Cir. 1984). This means that all motions and appeals related to his conviction that are now pending in the state district court and in the Nevada Supreme Court must be concluded before petitioner can file a federal habeas petition. The federal habeas petition will be dismissed, without prejudice, as petitioner has not

22 23

DENIED.

exhausted his claims in state court.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner's motion reconsideration of the denial of appointment of counsel (Docket #8) is **DENIED**.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner's motion for clarification (Docket #7) is

25 26

24

27 ///

///

28

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this habeas petition is **DISMISSED WITHOUT**PREJUDICE based on petitioner's failure to exhaust his grounds for relief in state court. The Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly.

Dated this 21st day of May, 2008.

LARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Kiche